



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ELlicott City HISTORIC DISTRICT ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov

410-313-2350

FAX 410-313-3467

TDD 410-313-2323

January Minutes

The first regular meeting for the year 2010 of the Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, January 7, 2010 in the Tyson Room II located at 8930 Stanford Boulevard in Columbia, Maryland.

Members present: Joseph Hauser, Chairman; Samuel Crozier, Vice Chairman; Eileen Tennor, Secretary, Lisa Badart and Robert Tennenbaum

Staff present: Samantha Stoney, Mina Hilsenrath, Dan Bennett, Jim Vannoy and Carol Stirn

Chairman Joseph Hauser opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. and asked the Commission members if there were any changes to the December 3, 2009 minutes. Joseph Hauser made a motion to approve the minutes as written; Eileen Tennor seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. #09-36 – 4688 Beechwood Road, Ellicott City, HO-455
2. #09-42 – 8227 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. #09-41 – 3675 College Avenue, Ellicott City, HO-347
4. #09-43 – 3845 College Avenue, Lot 2, Ellicott City

#09-36 – 4688 Beechwood Road, Ellicott City, HO-455

Tax credit pre-approval to replace roof and dormer shingles.

Applicant: Allan S. Danoff and Marguerite A. Donnelly

Background & Scope of Work: This item was originally supposed to be on the November agenda, but the Applicant requested it be delayed until the January hearing. The Applicant seeks retroactive tax credit pre-approval for replacement of the roof, which was replaced prior to pre-approval due to emergency leaking. The property is not located in a historic district, but is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory and therefore only requires pre-approval and final approval for tax credits. The Applicant dropped off the application at the Department of Planning and Zoning front counter after the deadline for the October meeting. The application noted that the roof was deteriorating, but the Applicant did not inform HDC staff that an emergency condition existed or that consideration at the October meeting was desired. The application could have been added to the October agenda as an emergency item if the request had been made on the application or through direct contact with staff.

Staff Comments: According to the County Code and Rules of Procedure, all work must be pre-approved in order to be eligible for tax credits. Rule 201.E states “the Commission shall not approve tax credits for any work that is commenced or expenses incurred before the work is initially approved by the Commission.” Section 20.112(4)(b) and (c) of the County Codes defines eligible work as: after the owner receives initial approval of an application for a certificate of eligibility; and in conformity with the

application for which initial approval was given. Unfortunately the County Code and Rules of Procedure are very clear that tax credits must be pre-approved.

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends Denial of tax credit pre-approval.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in the Applicant, Allan Danoff. Mr. Danoff explained that he hand-carried the tax credit application to the Department of Planning and Zoning approximately 10 days prior to the October meeting date. At that time, HDC Staff was not available so Mr. Danoff handed the packet to a gentleman at the Public Information Counter, requesting that this item be placed on the October agenda. Mr. Danoff said he never heard back from anyone, nor did he call to speak with Staff. Mr. Danoff stated that since the roof was an emergency and had to be repaired, he had no choice but to proceed. On October 6, 12 and 19, he obtained estimates from three MD licensed home improvement roofing contractors. The work to repair the roof was done during the week of October 23, 2009. Mr. Danoff said he feels there should be a process to correct the error, because he hand-carried the application and asked for it to be placed on the October agenda.

Mr. Hauser asked Ms. Stoney how many days prior to the meeting date the application had to be submitted. Ms. Stoney confirmed at that time the deadline was 15 days prior to the meeting. Mr. Hauser told Mr. Danoff that if he brought the application in only 10 days prior to the meeting date, then the application was late. Sam Crozier asked if the work was completed. Mr. Danoff answered that it was completed. Ms. Tenner asked if there was any kind of recourse in this situation. Ms. Stoney stated there is not because the Rules of Procedure have to comply with the County Code. Mr. Vannoy stated there is an emergency request process, but since Mr. Danoff did not communicate with Ms. Stoney, the process did not take place. Mr. Vannoy also explained that legally the Rules of Procedure and County Code clearly state that pre-approval must be obtained before any work is done in order to be eligible for the tax credit. Mr. Hauser told Mr. Danoff that the Commission must follow the County Code and they would not be able to grant the tax credit. Mr. Crozier asked if the Rules of Procedure state anywhere that an emergency situation must be submitted in writing. Ms. Stoney replied that it does not, but she must be notified to add it to the agenda and follow the emergency addition procedure. Mr. Vannoy clarified that if the application was denied, the Applicant has the right to appeal the decision in the Circuit Court.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Deny the tax credit as per the staff recommendation. Lisa Badart seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous to Deny.

#09-42 – 8227 Main Street, Ellicott City

Install two signs.

Applicant: Cindi K. Ryland

Background & Scope of Work: The Applicant proposes to install two signs on the front of the building. There would be one projecting sign, which would be hung on an existing bracket. This sign would vertically read “RETROPOLITAN”. The other sign would be painted above the door, where there is currently a blank arched white panel. This sign would horizontally read “RETROPOLITAN”.

Staff Comments: Chapter 11.B.1 of the Guidelines recommends against using “two signs per business façade”, especially “where one is sufficient to provide an easily visible identification of the business”. The projecting sign is vertical and is long and linear to accommodate the name of the business. However, the vertical spelling and boxes around the lettering makes the sign difficult to read. The length

of the sign appears to hang over the tip of the lancet arch above the door, detracting from the architectural details of the building. When the building was in use as a church, the panel in the arch above the door was used as the sign. As such, this seems the most historically appropriate place for a sign. Staff suggests only the flat mounted sign be used.

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends Approval of the flat mounted sign.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in the Applicant, Cyndi Ryland, who is the owner of Retropolitan. She has been a shop owner in Ellicott City since 1997. Ms. Ryland explained there are three different locations on the facade of the building where signs have previously been hung. There was a round plaque located to the left of the front door, a projecting sign above the arch and a white painted sign in the arch above the front door. Ms. Ryland is seeking approval for two signs, one projecting sign on the existing bracket and one flat sign in the arch above the front door. Ms. Ryland stated the sign in the arch above the front door would not allow customers walking or driving down the street to clearly see her store. The sidewalk is narrow in front of the shop and there are no retail spaces directly across the street. Ms. Ryland thinks the hanging sign is necessary for business. She indicated that she is open to changing the look of the hanging sign if it is difficult to read and said the sign will be fastened to the front of the building just above the lancet.

Mr. Hauser asked if there were any comments from the Commission. Lisa Badart asked about the round plaque. Ms. Ryland explained she just wanted to show the Commission that there was also a space for a round name plaque and confirmed that she was just proposing the two signs as shown on the application. Ms. Tennor stated that the vertical projecting sign is hard to read with the lines around the name. Ms. Tennor explained that the sign needs to stop above the lancet arch instead of coming down to the white space. Ms. Ryland stated it is attached to the building above the brick edge. Ms. Tennor asked for clarification about the new bracket that would be installed under the bottom of the sign, and asked if the bottom of the sign will extend down through the top of the brick lancet arch. She suggested that the sign should be slightly smaller so that it does not interfere with the brickwork. Ms. Tennor explained the signs may look better with a black background with white letters. Ms. Tennor stated that both sign elements should be the same color scheme so they tie in together. She proposed that both signs be allowed, with a black background and white lettering, and that the hanging sign should not extend below the top of the arch.

Mr. Hauser asked if there was any more discussion. Dan Bennett asked if there were any recommendations about the dimensions. The present dimension is 60 inches. Ms. Tennor said the sign should be between 50 inches to 52 inches long. She suggested a black sign in the arch be constructed separately and installed, instead of painting the existing panel black.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve the application to use the projecting sign from the existing bracket, with a new bottom bracket installed above the existing arch, and that a second sign parallel to the face of the building be installed in the opening over the door, both in the same colors. The color scheme would be a black background and white lettering. Mr. Tennenbaum seconded. Four of the Commission members approved; Chairman Hauser abstained.

#09-41 – 3675 College Avenue, Ellicott City, HO-347

Replace siding on parish office, demolish two-story house, and construct new building

Applicant: Father Matt Buening

Background & Scope of Work: This application is being continued from the December 2009 meeting. The Applicant proposes to replace the siding on the parish office with Certainteed fiber cement lap siding with a wood grain texture. The Applicant also proposes to demolish a two-story foursquare house and to construct a new building on the site of the foursquare.

The Commission had no objection to the use of the wood finish Certainteed fiber cement lap siding at the December hearing. After a lengthy discussion on the design of the proposed new construction, the Commission voted to continue the application to the January meeting. The Commission expressed an interest in seeing additional studies for details of the windows, stone color and texture, locations for the mechanical equipment and the 50/50 ratio of stone to stucco.

Staff Comments: The Applicant submitted revised drawings, showing alternative designs for the North and South elevations, and new building materials and colors.

Windows: The revised drawings show equal sashes on the windows. The curved clerestory window on the gable has been changed to a series of 4 square windows, to match those above the entryway. Sills were added to the 1:1 windows on the second floor of the north elevation. At the December meeting the Commission and Staff suggested using 1:1 windows. However, after evaluating the alternative designs, Staff finds the original unequal sash proposal presents a verticality that is in harmony with the contemporary character of the building. Staff finds the redesigned clerestory window on the gable, which is square instead of rounded, to be more compatible with the rectilinear building design.

Stone color and texture: The Applicant identified a new stone color that has more grey and black tones, reflecting the color of granite found in Ellicott City. New colors were also shown for the stucco, roof, aluminum storefront windows, doors, downspouts and cornice to match the new stone. The proposed color of the stucco wings is Plymouth Rock, the central gable element is Waynesboro Taupe, the roof Charcoal, the windows and doors Champagne, the downspouts and cornice Temptation and the stone Commonwealth Chiseled. The proposed new colors look different on the sketch and the color sheet, but Staff finds the grey stone may be more compatible with the colors found on the site and within the historic district. The dark grey gutters and cornice seem very prominent on the building; it is possible that a lighter color may be better for this element.

Mechanical equipment: The mechanical equipment could not be relocated due to a 10 foot water easement running between the Parish Office and the proposed new building. The mechanical area was reconfigured by lowering the level of the equipment pad and enclosing the area with a low stone wall. The stone wall is built into the hillside and will match the stone used on the building. Staff commends the architects for the new design and finds it to be an attractive solution.

Stone and stucco proportions: On new Elevation 1, the North elevation, the revised drawing shows the original 50/50 proportions with the new color scheme. Option 1A has a greater amount of stucco, with the stone lowered to end just above the top of the windows on the first floor. Option 1B has a greater amount of stone, with the stone raised to the bottom of the 2nd story windows. After evaluating the alternative designs, staff finds the proportions on the original design or Option 1A to be the most pleasing.

On new Elevation 2, the South elevation, a stone band is added along the wing with the storefront windows. Option 2A takes into consideration a suggestion by the Commission to remove the bottom portion of the storefront windows and replace it with stone. Staff prefers the storefront window

verticality and stone treatment of Elevation 2 and finds the greater proportion of stone and shorter windows in Option 2A considerably less pleasing.

Summary: Staff is amenable to the original design proposal or the proposed North elevation shown in Option 1A. On the South elevation, Staff prefers the original proposal without stone along the storefront windows or the new Elevation 2 which has stone, but maintains the floor to ceiling storefront windows. Staff likes the simplification of the windows on the gabled element and the new solution to hiding the mechanical equipment. Staff would like to thank the architects and the Applicant for submitting the various alternative schemes, which better help the Commission and Staff visualize the suggested changes.

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends:

1. Approval of fiber cement lap siding on the parish office in a wood grain finish.
2. Approval of demolition, only if new construction is approved concurrently.
3. Approval of proposed new construction as determined by the Commission.

Testimony: Chairman Hauser swore in Father Buening and Jeffrey Penza of Penza Bailey Architects. Mr. Penza explained that in Option 1 the stone is raised to the sills of the windows, but appears heavy with too much stone; in Option 2 the stone is lower and aligns with the top of the windows. Mr. Penza stated that more detail has been added to the windows. He also showed elevations with equal 1:1 windows. In the central gable element, the windows are now square instead of curved. Mr. Penza brought a stone sample as requested by the Commission that more closely resembles the color of Ellicott City granite. He explained that the new color only has a three-stone pattern, but can be turned in different directions to create the effect of randomly placed stone. Mr. Penza explained that the color of the stucco will be taupe, which has more grey tones, making it compatible with the new stone color.

Mr. Penza explained that the mechanical equipment slab will be lowered, and a stone wall will be constructed around it to enclose the equipment. Mr. Penza added that his client requests to have pole lights installed instead of the step lights because of maintenance issues.

Mr. Hauser swore in Michael Smith, an Ellicott City resident. Mr. Smith asked Mr. Penza if the metal roof was still part of the application. Mr. Penza stated the metal roof on the gable has not changed and the flat roof is a vegetative roof. Mr. Smith is concerned that the proposed building is too institutional looking for this corner, and he does not feel the materials mimic the materials used in the historic district. He feels the stone shown in the elevations presented are an improvement. Mr. Smith expressed concern that the building will not be compatible with the neighborhood and the church setting. Mr. Smith explained the size of the proposed building is of concern because it is very large and will fill up the entire slope. Mr. Smith said that he understands that the church's needs have grown and is not opposed to the use, but feels the architecture and design need to complement the church and the historic district. Mr. Tennenbaum agreed with Mr. Smith that the corner is important because it serves as entrance to the church campus. Mr. Tennenbaum said he thinks the stone wall concealing the mechanical equipment was a good design solution. Ms. Tennor and Mr. Tennenbaum said they find that the darker color for the downspouts adds to the aesthetic of building. Mr. Tennenbaum found the proportions were still not correct and offered suggestions for connecting the upper and lower windows to fix the proportions. Mr. Tennenbaum expressed his displeasure with the design and said the building was a mix between contemporary and traditional.

Ms. Tennor said the windows are not detailed and look stark as a result. Mr. Crozier asked if the windows are flush against the stucco and Mr. Penza confirmed that they are. Father Buening stated that

the windows are a flexible budget item that can be upgraded. Mr. Penza suggested that the windows could be framed with thicker stucco to create depth.

Mr. Smith stated he is concerned with the north elevation because it is visible driving up the street. Mr. Hauser suggested using a low stone wall, instead of the current guardrail, along the edge of College Avenue, which could tie the elements together. Mr. Hauser thought landscaping should be addressed for the north and west side. Mr. Penza said they are developing a landscape plan, but have not yet submitted it yet. Ms. Stoney explained that a landscape plan is required and would have to come before the Commission.

Mr. Hauser asked if there is a consensus for approval of some of the items discussed. Mr. Tennenbaum replied that he was not satisfied with any of the options presented. Mr. Hauser asked if the Commission suggested a complete redesign or approval with small changes to the design. The majority of Commission had no objection to south elevation Option 2 and north elevation Option 1. Mr. Hauser asked for a lighter color for the downspouts and roof. Ms. Tennor stated the contrast would be lost if the downspouts were a lighter color. Staff clarified that their recommendation for a lighter color was based on the color elevations which showed black downspouts. Staff has no objection to the dark charcoal presented by the Applicant at the meeting.

Motion: Chairman Hauser moved to approve the application as per staff recommendations 1) approval of fiber cement lap siding on the parish office in a wood grain finish and 2) approval of demolition, only if new construction is approved concurrently.

Mr. Hauser also moved to approve staff recommendation 3) approval of proposed new construction as determined by the Commission, with the following items approved:

- 1) South Elevation Option 2
- 2) East Elevation 3
- 3) North Elevation Option 1
- 4) West Elevation 4
- 5) New stone submitted at meeting, 3 sizes and black and grey toned color
- 6) New colors submitted at meeting for stucco, windows and trim
- 7) New HVAC enclosure
- 8) Lighting styles with locations to be submitted with landscape plan
- 9) Windows recessed into stucco with projecting sills

Items to be brought back to the Commission:

- 10) Landscape plan, with a low stone wall replacing the guardrail and lighting locations.

Items for Staff approval:

- 11) Screening of the roof HVAC with three elevation views for staff to decide style and color. Staff can decide if a corral is necessary. If there are problems deciding on the appropriate solution Staff can bring the proposal back to the Commission for Approval.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Badart. Four Commission members approved. Mr. Tennenbaum opposed.

#09-43 – 3845 College Avenue, Lot 2, Ellicott City

Construct new house.

Applicant: Marcus Paul Building and Development Group, LLC

Background & Scope of Work: On December 1, 2005 this property was presented to the Commission for advisory comments as HDC-05-60 for a subdivision in which two new lots were created. The plans that have been submitted are for Lot 2; plans for Lot 1 have not yet been submitted.

The Applicant proposes to construct a new house at 3845 College Ave, Lot 2, which is accessed from Ross Road. The proposed house is two-stories, but has an attic, essentially making it appear to be a 3-story house. There will be a front-loaded two car garage with white steel doors to resemble carriage doors. There are two large front gables on the primary facade which will have HardieShingle as an accent while the remaining siding will be HardiePlank lap siding. The garage and entryway will use a stone veneer. The materials to be used on the house will be:

- 1) Roof – GAF Timberline 30 year shingles in Charcoal
- 2) Siding – Hardieplank Lap Cedarmill lap siding in Cobblestone and Hardieshingle in Boothbay Blue with White trim
- 3) Windows – Anderson 200 series doublehung and casement vinyl clad wood in White
- 4) Shutters – Certainteed fiberglass paneled in Countrylane Red
- 5) Doors - ThermaTru stained fiberglass
- 6) Exterior lighting – Black traditional looking
- 7) Rear deck – Trex with White vinyl railing

Staff Comments: The lot is located on a pipestem drive way off Ross Road and is not highly visible from College Avenue. Chapter 8.B of the Guidelines (page 57) recommends “design new buildings to be compatible with neighboring buildings in bulk, ratio of height to width, and the arrangement of door and window openings.” The proposed plan incorporates traditional elements which are compatible with neighboring buildings, such as gables double hung windows, and lap siding. However, the house also appears to be a mixture of styles, with a Greek Revival entryway, country-style shutters, and craftsman style shake shingles. The buildings surrounding the site are all vernacular style residential structures. The lot sits below Ross Road and is lower than the existing houses, reducing its appearance.

The front door entryway has a Greek Revival pediment over the porch, which is framing a full length window with shutters, not a door. The front door is accessed from the side. The placement of the window where a door should be is architecturally confusing. The pitch of the pediment is also very low, whereas the two front gables and the dormer window have steep pitches. There are two large front gables on the house which will be accented with blue shingles.

Chapter 8.B of the Guidelines (page 58) recommends “shutters, if used, should be operable or appear to be operable, appropriately sized and made of painted wood. Metal or plastic shutters are not recommended.” The proposed shutters are Fiberglass, even if not operable, appear to be operable on the rendering which shows them “held back” with hardware.

Chapter 8.B (page 58) also recommends “use materials common to the historic district, such as wood siding, wood shingles, brick, stone or stucco.” The Guidelines (page 59) indicate that substitute siding can be appropriate if it resembles wood siding, which the proposed HardiePlank siding will do.

Chapter 7.C of the Guidelines (page 54) recommends “new garages and sheds should follow the historic pattern of being detached from the main building and, if practical, located in a side or rear yard.” The

two car garage is located on the front of the house because the very narrow lot does not allow for a detached or side garage.

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends alternative concepts for the entryway be studied. Staff recommends Approval as determined by the Commission.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in the builder, Scott Hare, and the contract purchaser, Doug Abraham. Mr. Hare explained that the site is restrictive in size, so they had to choose a house that would fit. He tried to find a design with historic elements that would be compatible with the historic district. Mr. Hare provided clarification on the location of Lot 1 and Lot 2. He stated that Lot 1 will be a future project, a house design has not yet been chosen for the lot.

Mr. Tennenbaum said the house should be simplified to one style instead of using mixed styles, which was mentioned in the staff report. Mr. Hauser said the house design should be a simple style to fit into the vernacular historic area. Mr. Hauser suggested the Applicants should come back to the Commission with a simplified version, which should address the gables to be compatible with neighboring buildings, a consistent roof line and a front entrance. Mr. Hauser stated that the side gable main roof has two different heights and suggested making that one continuous roof line with the upper gable centered. Mr. Tennenbaum suggested removing the Greek Revival pediment and continuing the standing seam metal roof across. Mr. Abraham stated that he liked the concept of continuing the roof. By fixing the roof lines, the dormer window above the front door will become a normal window, which also cuts down on the number of roof lines and simplifies the front of the house.

Mr. Tennenbaum asked Mr. Abraham if he was familiar with the Craftsman style because many of the elements listed for the house are in that style. Mr. Tennenbaum asked about the stone on the front of the house. Mr. Abraham stated that he likes the stone on the front facade and would prefer to keep it. Sam Crozier stated that the stone around the front porch should be extended around the corner. Mr. Abraham confirmed that the stone wrapped around the left side and he is amenable to wrapping it on the right side as well.

Mr. Tennenbaum said that some the windows are lined up, but others are scattered and need to be more organized, especially on the facade. Mr. Hare stated the windows are functional per the floor plan. Mr. Abraham said some of the windows could be removed, but some could not. Mr. Hauser stated that in the historic district the windows need to be looked at from the outside and not designed from the inside, so they need to be symmetrical to the elevation. Mr. Hauser explained that most historic houses have windows that are symmetrical from the outside view.

Mr. Crozier asked if this plan has been reviewed by engineering for approval. Ms. Stoney stated the site development plan has submitted and is being reviewed.

Mr. Tennenbaum asked if any trees were being removed. Ms. Stoney stated the Commission has to approve the removal of live trees with a 12-inch or greater diameter or trees that are 4-1/2 feet above ground level that are planned to be removed in connection with the construction of the new house. The builder stated that there are no trees of that size that need to come down.

Mr. Tennenbaum stated that all four elevations should be built with the same material. Mr. Hare stated that HardiePlank would be used on all four sides, with a dry stack stone in the front, or any stone the Commission would prefer. Mr. Hauser said there were too many proposed colors. Ms. Tennor suggested the Applicant submit samples to the staff. Mr. Hauser asked for and received confirmation that the

eaves and fascia will be wrapped; the soffits will be vented and will be white. Mr. Hare said he can specify the color scheme. Mr. Hauser asked if the gutters are K-gutters. The Commission will leave the gutter choice open, but said they should be the same color as the trim. The Applicant plans to use Anderson 200 series windows with exterior grills. Mr. Hauser said the windows should be 6:1 with snap-in exterior grilles, to keep with the Craftsman style. Mr. Hauser said the house would look fine without the shutters and recommended removing them from the design and coming back to the Commission at a later date if Mr. Abraham felt they were necessary. Mr. Hauser explained that removing the shutters simplifies the color scheme on the house. Ms. Stoney said that if the Applicant would like to use shutters, the Guidelines recommend using wood.

Mr. Hauser stated before the vote is taken, there is request for public comment from Michael Smith, who had previously been sworn in. Mr. Smith stated that he was concerned about the development of the proposed house, because it is on a small lot. He is concerned about the use of a metal roof, the HardiePlank on the exterior, and thinks the shutters should be wood and operable. He would prefer to see a two-car garage that is not visible or thinks the Applicant should not build one at all. Mr. Smith states the house will be visible both from College Avenue and Church Road. He feels this style of home will not be compatible with the neighborhood or the historic district. Mr. Hauser addressed Mr. Smith's concerns, explaining that many of his concerns have been addressed by the Commission and that new construction is held to a different standard than historic structures, such as Mr. Smith's home.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to approve the application contingent upon:

- 1) A continuous roof line of the side gabled main roof with a centered gable
- 2) The dormer above the entry pediment will become a window
- 3) The entry pediment becomes a continuation of the shed roof
- 4) Lap siding with square shingles in gables
- 5) Stone as shown on porch to wrap around the corner to the front door
- 6) White trim on gutter
- 7) Shutters to be removed
- 8) Louvers in gable removed, shingles should be carried all the way up
- 9) 6:1 Anderson windows, preferably snap on

The following items must be submitted for Staff approval:

- 10) Revised drawings per above changes
- 11) Roof shingles
- 12) Stone colors
- 13) Metal roof sample grey as shown on illustration

The motion seconded by Mr. Crozier. The vote was unanimous to approve.

The meeting adjourned at 10:14 pm.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Elmina J. Hilsenrath, ASLA
Executive Secretary

Joseph Hauser, Chairperson

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary

T:\DPZ\Shared\RCD\HDC\Minutes\2010\January Minutes.docx